1	ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
2	DD AET 16 (17 2011
3	DRAFT - Minutes of May 17, 2011
4 5	ATTENDEES: Doug Kirkwood – Chairman, Carl Miller, Robert Rowe, Wil Sullivan,
6	Alternate, Jim Quinn, Alternate, Jamie Ramsay, Beth Davis, Alternate, and Charlie
7	Tiedemann - Planning Director
8	Troublinding Director
9	The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. Chairman Doug Kirkwood explained the
10	Zoning process and introduced Board members. Doug Kirkwood asked that Beth Davis
11	vote in the absence of Joe Taggart.
12	
13	Case 1458: Lot 2-127-1 Stearns and Boston Post Roads: Variance – William L.
14	Paxton, 64 Stearns Road, Amherst, NH 03031 (owner), requests a Variance from the
15	provisions of the Amherst Zoning Ordinance Art. IV, Sec. 4.12 Watershed Protection
16	District, Para. 4.12.1.2 Regulations. In order that he may construct an addition to his
17	existing dwelling that will be 89 feet +/- from the edge of a fire pond (100 feet required).
18	Residential / Rural Zone (Watershed Protection District, Flood Plain Conservation
19	District, and Aquifer Conservation District overlays)
20 21	Attorney Greg Michael, representing the applicant, indicated he is pleased to see so many
22	board members present this evening. Attorney Michael explained the Paxton property
23	and referenced the fire protection pond and its reference to Mr. Paxton's home. Building
24	elevations were provided to the members. 100 feet is the required setback from the fire
25	pond.
26	
27	Attorney Michael explained this plan is not contrary to public interest. Setbacks from the
28	fire pond (which is artificial) cannot be achieved. There is no threat to health safety or
29	welfare and it does not alter the existing neighborhood. Spirit of the Ordinance is
30	observed. This addition is a 16 x 16 foot attachment to the house. The Ordinance does
31	allow other things in this same area which would create a greater impact to the
32 33	neighborhood. Substantial justice – the style, location and layout is good to attach the proposed addition. There is no gain to the public in denying this application. This is the
34	setback for the artificial fire pond, it is not a natural wetland. This will still be a single
35	family residence. This will not encroach on any neighbor setbacks. Hardship, this parcel
36	has a fire pond within its property which makes is difficult for the owner to meet the
37	zoning requirements. The closest structure will be 89 feet away, 100 feet is required.
38	This is a reasonable use and many people build additions to their homes. Tom Carr,
39	CWS, from Meridian Land Services, was notified and has indicated there are 89 feet of
40	heavy density (woods) between the proposed addition and the fire pond and notes this has
41	no environmental impact to the surrounding area. The five criteria are met and the
42	elevations are in the Board's packets.
43	Description and advantage 11 41 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
44 45	Doug Kirkwood asked if all this land is above the 100 year flood plain. Attorney
45 46	Michael said yes, it is permeable soils as well. Beth Davis asked about the fire pond, why was it built? Mr. Paxton bought the property 18 months ago and the fire pond was
TU	why was it ount: with ranion obugit the property to months ago and the fire poilt was

46

- 47 there at the time but the Fire Chief explained to him that the fire pond is used to refill the
- 48 fire equipment but has not been used in many years. Wil Sullivan asked if there is an
- 49 easement. Attorney Michael did not do the title search therefore he is unaware. Robert
- Rowe asked if there is a letter from the Engineer (Tom Carr) in the packet. Attorney
- 51 Michael provided that letter. Beth Davis is interested in how the fire pond is used, and
- 52 whether or not this requirement would apply, since it is being treated as though it is a
- 53 natural watershed. Does the relief being requested have any negative affect on the pond?
- It sounds as though the pond is not used that much by the Fire Department. Jamie
- Ramsay asked if there are fire hydrants are on Stearns Road. Charlie Tiedemann
- responded that Pennichuck has installed hydrants on Stearns Road and the Fire
- 57 Department would prefer to get water from Pennichuck rather than the fire pond. Charlie
- Tiedemann also stated that the fire pond has been there since he's been in town and it is
- treated as a watershed. Carl Miller said there is a hydrant right next to the pond. Mr.
- Paxton noted there is, and it is used to draw the water in. Carl Miller said he cannot
- 61 imagine the Fire Department taking water from a pond if there are hydrants they can use.
- 63 Jim Quinn suggested the application should be signed by the applicant Mr. Paxton.
- 64 Attorney Michael indicated that it has been signed on Charlie Tiedemann's copy. Jim
- Quinn asked about the original plan and the additions to the plan. Charlie Tiedemann
- explained that is to show what was there that is within the requirements and what the
- proposed new addition is.

DELIBERATIONS:

68 69

62

- Carl Miller moved to enter deliberations. Beth Davis seconded. All were in favor.
- 70 71 72

Case 1458:

- 73 74
- 75 Carl Miller moved no regional impact. Beth Davis seconded. All were in favor. .
- 76 77
- II. Conclusions [RSA 674:33, I (b)]:
- 78
- 79 1. The Variance will not be contrary to the public interest.
- Carl Miller-yes, Jamie Ramsay-yes, Beth Davis-yes, Robert Rowe-yes, Doug Kirkwood-yes.
- 82

True: 5, Not True: 0

83

- 2. The Variance is consistent with the spirit and intent of the Ordinance.
- 85 Robert Rowe-yes, this will not cause any issues; Beth Davis-yes, Jamie Ramsay-yes, Carl
- 86 Miller-yes, Doug Kirkwood-yes
 - True: 5, Not True: 0

87 88

- 89 3. Substantial justice is done.
- Jamie Ramsay-yes, Carl Miller-yes, Robert Rowe-yes putting an addition on the side
- 91 would be problematic; Beth Davis-yes, Doug Kirkwood-yes
- 92 True: 5, Not True: 0

93	
94	4. The values of surrounding properties will not be diminished.
95	Beth Davis-yes, the scope of addition and the value to the property will maintain property
96	values; Carl Miller-yes; Robert Rowe-yes, Jamie Ramsay-yes, Doug Kirkwood-yes
97	True: 5, Not True: 0
98	
99	5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the Ordinance would result in an
100	unnecessary hardship.
101	(Apply tests under A or B below)
102	(
103	A. For purposes of this subparagraph, "unnecessary hardship" means that, owing
104	to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area:
105	to openim constitute property man mountgates to frequence in the mem
106	(1) No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public
107	purposes of the Ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the
108	property; and
109	rr;;; <u></u>
110	(2) The proposed use is a reasonable one.
111	Jamie Ramsay-yes, general purpose of the ordinance is health and safety of the general
112	public; Carl Miller-yes this pond is not something necessary and is probably more of a
113	mud hole; Robert Rowe-yes, Beth Davis-yes, Doug Kirkwood-yes
114	True: 5. Not True: 0
115	
116	B. If the criteria in subparagraph A are not established, an unnecessary hardship
117	will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owing to special conditions of the property that
118	distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in
119	strict conformance with the Ordinance, and a Variance is therefore necessary to enable a
120	reasonable use of it. True:, Not True:
121	
122	The application passed all tests, therefore the Chairman declared the application is
123	approved.
124	
125	Jamie Ramsay moved to come out of deliberations at 7:28 p.m. Beth Davis seconded.
126	All were in favor.
127	·
128	Minutes: Minutes of November 16, 2010, and March 15, 2011
129	
130	November 16, 2010
131	Charlie Tiedemann previously sent copies of the minutes to everyone.
132	
133	Carl Miller moved to approve as submitted. Jamie Ramsay seconded. All were in favor.
134	
135	March 15, 2011
136	Jamie Ramsey moved to approve as submitted. Carl Miller seconded.
137	
138	Robert Rowe abstained since he was not in attendance at the meeting

139 140 Carl Miller, Jamie Ramsay and Doug Kirkwood were in favor with Jim Quinn, Beth 141 Davis, Wil Sullivan and Robert Rowe abstaining. Motion passed. 142 143 144 **OLD/NEW BUSINES:** 145 146 Charlie Tiedemann asked if Doug Kirkwood would like to wait on the elections of 147 officers. He is unaware of anyone that is interested in an officer position or joining the 148 ZBA. Doug Kirkwood suggested having the elections in June to see if there may be any 149 new members. Doug Kirkwood asked how the meeting looks for June. Charlie 150 Tiedemann responded that right now there aren't any applications; the deadline (for 151 applications) for that meeting is Monday May 23. 152 153 Charlie Tiedemann will add the election of officers to the next meeting agenda that has 154 applications. 155 156 Charlie Tiedemann said there was a land use bill being put through to change the way 157 condos or condo associations are notified. That change is to notify each owner, not just 158 the association, but it has not passed yet, it would be \$7 per owner. Condo associations 159 do not pay taxes, so the owners are not tracked. There should be a bill that forces the 160 developer to start the association but then get addresses of who will maintain it. Beth 161 Davis indicated they usually have a management company, but if there is no Board, it 162 gets forgotten. Charlie Tiedemann thinks the common land should be taxed and that 163 might get the attention of the association and owners. Beth Davis indicated if they are 164 single building condos, the common area is owned by all of the owners. 165 There being no further business before this Board, Beth Davis moved to adjourn at 7:40 166 167 p.m. Jamie Ramsay seconded. All were in favor. 168 169 Respectfully submitted, 170 171 172 Darlene J. Bouffard 173 **Recording Secretary**